

REMARKS

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 14, 2004 (Paper No. 8). Claims 30 to 69 are in the application, of which Claims 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60, 65, 68 and 69 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 30 to 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,228,118 (Sasaki). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns determining if a device driver corresponding to an obtained device ID is installed in an information processing apparatus. To do so, the information processing apparatus obtains a device ID from a device when the information processing apparatus detects a connected cable. The device ID is one of different device IDs provided for each device model. A warning is issued when the information processing apparatus determines that the device driver corresponding to the obtained device ID is not installed. In addition, the device driver corresponding to the obtained device ID may be installed by the information processing apparatus when it is determined that the device driver is not installed.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent claim 30 describes an information processing apparatus which is connectable to a device via a cable. The apparatus includes: a detecting unit adapted to detect whether or not the cable is connected to the information processing apparatus; an obtaining unit adapted to obtain a device ID which is defined as one of different IDs provided for each device model in response to a detection, by said detecting unit, of the connected cable; a discriminating unit adapted to discriminate whether or not a device driver corresponding to the obtained device

ID is installed; and a warning unit adapted to warn when said discriminating unit discriminates that the device driver corresponding to the obtained device ID is not installed in the information processing apparatus.

In contrast, Sasaki discloses selection of device drivers through detection of interpreters such as printing control language interpreters. To detect the interpreters, Sasaki discloses the use of interpreter identification data that indicate the type of an interpreter provided in a printer (Column 5, lines 32 to 43). Thus the interpreter identification data of Sasaki does not indicate a device model defined for each device as called for in claim 30. Therefore, Applicant submits that the present invention as claimed in claim 30 is not anticipated by Sasaki.

With regard to amended independent claims 35, 40 and 45, they are directed to a method, a computer-readable storage medium and a computer program product, respectively, which correspond to claim 30. Each claim calls for a device ID which is defined as one of different IDs provided for each device model. Applicant submits that the foregoing discussion with regard to claim 30 applies equally to amended independent claims 35, 40 and 45. Therefore, Applicant submits that the present invention as claimed in claims 35, 40 and 45 is not anticipated by Sasaki.

Amended independent claim 50 is directed to an information processing apparatus which is connectable to a device via a cable. The apparatus includes: detecting means for detecting whether or not the cable is connected to the information processing apparatus; obtaining means for obtaining a device ID which is defined as one of different IDs provided for each device model in response to a detection, by the detecting means, of the connected cable; first determination means for determining whether or not the connected device can be supported on the basis of the device ID obtained by the obtaining

means; and installing means for installing a device driver corresponding to the device ID obtained by the obtaining means, when it is determined by the first determination means that the connected device can not be supported.

As amended, claim 50 now includes a device ID which is defined as one of different IDs provided for each device model. Applicant submits that the foregoing discussion with regard to claim 30 applies equally to amended claim 50. Therefore, Applicant submits that the present invention as claimed in claim 50 is not anticipated by Sasaki.

Amended independent claims 55 and 60 are directed to a method and a program respectively which correspond to claim 50. As such, Applicant submits that the foregoing discussion with regard to claim 50 applies equally to amended independent claims 55 and 60. Therefore, Applicant submits that the present invention as claimed in claims 55 and 60 is not anticipated by Sasaki.

In view of the foregoing deficiencies of the applied art, amended independent claims 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55 and 60 and are believed to be allowable.

Dependent claims 31 to 34, 41 to 44, 46 to 49, 51 to 54, and 56 to 59 are each dependent from an amended independent claim as discussed above and are; therefore, believed allowable for the same reasons. In addition, because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration of each dependent claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

New independent claim 65 is directed to an information processing apparatus which is connectable to a device via a cable. The information processing apparatus includes: a detecting unit adapted to detect whether or not the a cable is connected to the information processing apparatus; an obtaining unit adapted to obtain a

device ID which the device determines to transmit to the information processing apparatus on the basis of a type of an optional unit which is attached to the device and in response to a detection by said detecting unit of the connected cable; and a discriminating unit adapted to discriminate whether or not a device driver corresponding to the obtained device ID exists in the information apparatus.

New dependent claim 66 includes a warning unit adapted to warn when the discriminating unit discriminates that the device driver corresponding to the obtained device ID does not exist in the information processing apparatus. New dependent claim 67 includes a selecting unit adapted to select a device driver corresponding to the device ID obtained by the obtaining unit, to activate the device driver when the discriminating means discriminates that the device driver corresponding to the obtained device ID exists in the information apparatus.

New independent claim 68 and 69 are directed to a method and a computer-readable storage medium respectively which correspond to claim 65.

In regard to new claims 65 to 69, Applicant submits the art of record is not seen to disclose or to suggest, either alone or in combination, the features of the claimed invention.

Based on the foregoing amendment and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. Scinto', written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 42419

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 79735v1